

REMARKS

The Official Action dated 21 January 2005 has been carefully considered, along with cited references, applicable sections of the Patent Act, Patent Rules, the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure and relevant decisional law.

Claim 1 is objected to because it appears that "orifices" in line 17 should be changed to --orifice--, in view of line 4 of the claim.

In response, in claim 1 line 17, "orifices" has been amended or changed to --orifice--.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In response, claim 1 has been amended according to the Examiner's suggestions.

However, the Examiner has kindly indicated that claim 1 would be allowable if written or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office Action, and thus claims 2-6 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

In response, claim 1 which is indicated to be allowable has been amended according to the Examiner's suggestions.

Claims 2 and 4-6 are dependent on the amended claim 1.

Claim 3 is dependent on claim 2.

Accordingly, claims 1-6 would appear to be allowable, and early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is accordingly most respectfully solicited.

Courtesy and cooperation of Examiner NOVOSAD are appreciated.

respectfully submitted,

By: Charles E. Baxley

CHARLES E. BAXLEY

Attorney of Record

USPTO Reg. 20,149

90 John Street – 3rd Floor

New York, N.Y. 10038

TEL: (212) 791-7200

FAX: (212) 791-7276

Date: New York, N.Y.